

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN DOE,
Plaintiff,
v.
COUNTY OF SONOMA et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-05195-JD

ORDER RE IFP STATUS

Re: Dkt. No. 80


In Doe's pending appeal, the Ninth Circuit made a limited referral to the Court to determine whether his in forma pauperis ("IFP") status should continue, or whether the appeal is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2); *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962).

Doe is not entitled to IFP status on appeal. The Section 1983 claims against the California state defendants were dismissed under the Eleventh Amendment. The claims against the Sonoma County defendants were dismissed because Doe did not allege facts that plausibly stated a claim under *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658, 691 (1978). See Dkt. Nos. 67, 75. Doe was given multiple opportunities to amend his complaint, but did not cure these deficiencies. Consequently, an appeal on these grounds is frivolous, and his IFP status is terminated.

The Clerk of the Court is requested to serve a copy of this order on plaintiff and the Ninth Circuit.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 27, 2020



JAMES DONATO
United States District Judge